

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 7 and 9-20 are now pending in the application. Applicant amends claims 2, 7, 9 and 15-20 herein. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2-4, 7 and 9-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant's traverse and solely in the interest of clarification, Applicant amends claims 2 and 20 to address the Examiner's concern. Specifically, Applicant removed all references to "user" and "one" (in the context of concern). Other claims have been similarly amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-4, 7-15, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofrichter (PCT/US01/45355) in view of Matsukura (U.S. Pat. No. 6,145,126), further in view of Audleman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,806,890). Claims 16, 18 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hofrichter (PCT/US01/45355) in view of Audleman (U.S. Pat. No. 6,806,890). These rejections

are respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding Applicant's traverse and solely in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends independent claims 2 and 15-20.

The amended independent claims now recite that the function provision module is determined "based on the device type included in said device information." As described in Applicant's specification as originally filed, the device type includes various functions such as facsimile (FAX) and printer. Particular support for these amendments will be found, for example, at least at lines 1-2 on page 52 of Applicant's specification as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is added.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention has an upper configuration that is different than that of Hofrichter, Matsukura, Audleman and the combination thereof. Applicant submits that the claimed configuration allows one to change the function of a network device without requiring technical knowledge. This reduces the time and effort required for making the change and facilitates the reduction of delivery times.

The Office Action alleges that Audleman teaches a device management terminal that includes a selection interface generating section for generating a selection interface through which one can select one or more of the functions corresponding to function provision module determined by said function determining section, and wherein said function selecting section presents the selection interface generated by said selection interface generating section to the user so that the user can select one or more of the functions.

However, the interface in Audleman relates to the management of computer-implemented systems, and in particular, to generating a graphical user interface from a

command syntax for managing multiple computer systems as one computer system. That is, a graphical user interface is generated by selecting a certain command syntax.

In contrast, in the claimed invention the function selecting section presents the selection interface generated by said selection interface generating section to the user so that the user can select one or more of the functions. Therefore, Audleman does not have a similar configuration.

Inasmuch as the prior art fails to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, the prior art cannot render claims 2 and 15-20 unpatentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 3, 4 and 7-14 are dependant claims and should be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 17, 2009

By: /Bryant E. Wade/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/nrk